UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

AUG 0 3 2010
OFFICE OF PETITIONS

ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO TX 75024

In re Application of

Anders Hoff et al

Application No. 09/467,420 : DECISION ON PETITION

Filed: December 20, 1999

Attorney Docket No. P12217-US1

This is a decision on the petition, filed August 13, 2002, and supplemented on August 26, 2008, under 37 CFR 1.181 (no fee) requesting withdrawal of the holding of abandonment in the above-identified application.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

The Office regrets the delay in replying to the above matter.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision should be filed within two (2) months from the mail date of this decision. *Note* 37 CFR 1.181(f). The request for reconsideration should include a cover letter and be entitled as a "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.181 to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment."

This application was held abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue fee and submit corrected drawings in reply to the Notice of Allowance and Notice of Allowability mailed February 25, 2002, which set a three (3) month shortened statutory period for reply. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on July 10, 2002.

Applicant files the present petition and declaration of Jennifer E. Garth, asserting that the Notice of Allowance and Notice of Allowability mailed February 25, 2002, was not received by Applicants' attorneys' law firm, Jenkens & Gilchrist. The declaration also states that "A review of the docket and file in the above matter indicates that the Notice of Allowability and the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due were never received by me nor was it ever entered into the Jenkens and Gilchrist docketing system for action to be taken." The declaration further states

that a hard copy of the computer docket record for the above-referenced application was attached. However the Office is not in receipt of the above.

Applicable Law, Rules and MPEP

The MPEP 711.03(c)A, Petition To Withdraw Holding of Abandonment Based on Failure To Receive Office Action, provides

In Delgar v. Schulyer, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971), the court decided that the Office should mail a new Notice of Allowance in view of the evidence presented in support of the contention that the applicant's representative did not receive the original Notice of Allowance. Under the reasoning of Delgar, an allegation that an Office action was never received may be considered in a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment. If adequately supported, the Office may grant the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment and remail the Office action. That is, the reasoning of Delgar is applicable regardless of whether an application is held abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue fee (35 U.S.C. 151) or for failure to prosecute (35 U.S.C. 133).

To minimize costs and burdens to practitioners and the Office, the Office has modified the showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office action. The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner describing the system used for recording an Office action received at the correspondence address of record with the USPTO. The statement should establish that the docketing system is sufficiently reliable. It is expected that the record would include, but not be limited to, the application number, attorney docket number, the mail date of the Office action and the due date for the response.

Practitioner must state that the Office action was not received at the correspondence address of record, and that a search of the practitioner's record(s), including any file jacket or the equivalent, and the application contents, indicates that the Office action was not received. A copy of the record(s) used by the practitioner where the non-received Office action would have been entered had it been received is required.

A copy of the practitioner's record(s) required to show non-receipt of the Office action should include the master docket for the firm. That is, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the master docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action. If no such master docket exists, the practitioner should so state and provide other evidence such as, but not limited to, the following: the application file jacket; incoming mail log; calendar; reminder system; or the individual docket record for the application in question. The showing outlined above may not be sufficient if there are circumstances that point to a conclusion that the Office action may have been lost after receipt rather than a conclusion that the Office action was lost in the mail (e.g., if the practitioner has a history of not receiving Office actions). (Emphasis supplied).

Analysis/conclusion

Regrettably, the petition is not grantable at this time. The Office requirements for granting a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment based upon non -receipt of an Office communication have been modified. A copy of the practitioner's record(s) required to show non-receipt of the Office action should include the master docket for the firm. That is, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the master docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action. If no such master docket exists, the practitioner should so state and provide other evidence such as, but not limited to, the following: the application file jacket; incoming mail log; calendar; reminder system; or the individual docket record for the application in question.

Accordingly, absent the required evidence to establish nonreceipt of the Notice of Allowance and Notice of Allowability mailed February 25, 2002, the petition requesting withdrawal of the holding of abandonment cannot be granted at this time.

If petitioner cannot supply the evidence necessary to withdraw the holding of abandonment, or simply does not wish to, petitioner should consider filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) stating that the delay was unintentional. Public Law 97-247, § 3, 96 Stat. 317 (1982), which revised patent and trademark fees, amended 35 U.S.C. § 41(a)(7) to provide for the revival of an "unintentionally" abandoned application without a showing that the delay in prosecution or in late payment of the issue fee was "unavoidable." This amendment to 35 U.S.C. § 41(a)(7) has been implemented in 37 CFR 1.137(b). An "unintentional" petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by the \$1,620.00 petition fee.

The filing of a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) cannot be intentionally delayed and therefore must be filed promptly. A person seeking revival due to unintentional delay cannot make a statement that the delay was unintentional unless the entire delay, including the date it was discovered that the application was abandoned until the filing of the petition to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(b), was unintentional. A statement that the delay was unintentional is not appropriate if petitioner intentionally delayed the filing of a petition for revival under 37 CFR 1.137(b).

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be delivered through one of the following mediums:

By mail:

Mail Stop PETITIONS Commissioner for Patents Post Office Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 By hand:

Customer Service Window

Mail Stop Petitions Randolph Building 40l Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22314

By fax:

(571) 273-8300

ATTN: Office of Petitions

By internet:

EFS-Web

www.uspto.gov/ebc/efs_help.html (for help using EFS-Web call the Patent Electronic Business Center

at (866) 217-9197)

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3208.

/KOC/ Karen Creasy Petitions Examiner Office of Petitions